DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 066 FL 019 773

AUTHOR Hayward, R. J.
TITLE Tone and Accent in the Qafar Noun.
PUB DATE Jul 91
NOTE 22p.; In: "Grammatical Phonetics: Studies in Honour of Jack Carnochan" (see FL 019 768).
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT York Papers in Linguistics; v15 p117-137 Jul 1991

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS African Languages; Foreign Countries; *Intonation; *Language Patterns; Language Research; Linguistic Theory; *Nouns; *Suprasegmentals; *Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS Cushitic Languages; *Gender (Language); *Qafar

ABSTRACT

A study of tone and accent in Qafar, a Cushitic language characterized by tonal rather than stress accent, modifies an earlier claim made about the relationship between accent and gender. The newer study makes a proposal that simplifies the account of gender in that this category is seen as determined rather than determining. This further suggests an explanation of how gender is acquired by Qafar speakers. The findings of the first study are outlined, and its conclusions about gender and the more recent findings concerning patterns of tone and accent are combined to make a correlation: if a lexical noun ends in a consonant and/or carries accent, it is masculine; otherwise, it is feminine. Loan words provide confirmation that this correlation is significant. A 13-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 338068

TONE AND ACCENT IN THE QAFAR NOUN

R. J. Hayward

This paper comes as a sequel to an analysis of tone and accent which was presented rather briefly in the Grammatical Notes appended to Parker and Hayward (1985). While the present paper does furnish some justification for and further illustrations of the earlier analysis, it also sets out to modify it with respect to one particular point, namely, the relationship between accent and gender. The revision of this point has important implications, both synchronic and diachronic.

I believe that the new proposal makes for a simpler account of gender in that (for Qafar) this category is seen as determined rather than determining, which further suggests a line of explanation for how gender might be acquired by speakers of this language. In this, the present approach is in line with more recent work on gender in Qafar (Hayward and Corbett, 1988). The re-analysis also makes good sense for comparative work, for it assumes that Qafar and Irob Saho can be analysed as having a common accentual system, and that the major difference between the two concerns only the rule of High Tone Association.

Both in the 1985 analysis and here, it is claimed that, like other members of the East Cushitic group, the Qafar-Saho languages display tonal accent rather than stress accent. But the evidence

York Papers in Linguistics 15 (1991) 117-137
©R. J. Hayward

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
HARLOW
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for this claim is far less obvious in the case of Qafar-Saho than in the cases of Somali (Hyman 1981; Banti, forthcoming), Oromo (Banti, forthcoming), Arbore (Hayward, 1984) or Rendille (Pillinger, 1988), for there has been an appreciable development of sentence prosody (intonation) in Qafar-Saho, and it may well be the case that the languages/dialects of this group are very close to a typological watershed.[1] Justification for the decision to treat the relation between pitch variation and prominence in the Qafar-Saho group as tonal accent is the subject of a paper currently in preparation, and here I simply assume that this term is appropriate.

I shall start with a review of the original analysis proposed in Parker and Hayward (1985: 218ff). In that account, accent and tone are distinguished in the following way. Accent is defined as an abstract marker of the potentiality for an association between a particular syllable[2] and a high tone. Accent is said to be either lexical or assigned by rules sensitive to certain morphosyntactic categories. Following the practice of Goldsmith (1976, 1982) and other phonologists working within the Autosegmental framework, accent, whether inherent or assigned, is indicated by means of an asterisk above the relevant vowel letter in the transcription. The term 'high tone' refers to a feature of (relatively) higher pitch which is associated with one particular syllable in the first word in a phrase. High tone is symbolised in phonological representations as H, and indicated in the transcription of examples by means of a grave accent. Syllables not associated with high tone generally have low pitch.[3]

[1]It should be noted that previous investigators have generally dealt with pitch prominence in Qafar and Saho as 'stress' (cf., for example, Welmers, 1952, Morin, 1977, Bliese, 1981). One reason for preferring an analysis in terms of tone and accent is that pitch contours associated with an intonational function in Qafar and Saho operate very largely in independence of accent and the high tone element of the tonal system, which is discussed in the paper.

[2]The term 'syllable' is used in an informal way as an abbreviation for referring to the 'nucleus of a syllable'. Whether this is the appropriate tone-bearing unit for Qafar, or whether we ought to invoke the 'mora', is itself a matter for debate. Without entering into a detailed justification for the decision here, I have opted for the former analysis.

[3]This statement requires qualification. The description in Parker and Hayward (1985: 222ff) makes it clear that Qafar has certain larger-domain phono-

As stated earlier, the domain of high tone is a unit which, for convenience, we may refer to as a 'phrase', since, in general, it is congruent with a syntactic constituent of that order. This is especially obvious in the case of noun phrases and postpositional phrases. However many words there are in a NP (or PP), high tone is only associated with one syllable, and this is always located in the first word of the phrase. Furthermore, within this first word, high tone can only ever be associated with one of the last three syllables. These statements are exemplified in 1–4. (In the examples, parenthesized material belongs to a phrase other than the one under consideration.)[4]

1. (a) *sagà (rabteh)*
(a) cow (died)

(b) *woò saga (rabteh)*
that cow (died)

(c) *sidicà saga (rabteh)*
three cows died

(d) *woò sidica saga (rabteh)*
those three cows (died)

(e) *qadò saga (rabteh)*
(a) white cow (died)

(f) *sidicà qado saga (rabteh)*
three white cows (died)

---

logical elements which we might appropriately regard as intonation. Such 'sentence prosodies' comprise segmental components which do not fit into the consonant and vowel systems of the language, they also comprise pitch features not analysable in terms of the tonal system considered in this paper. Moreover, rather than speaking of 'low tone', it seems preferable to say that the relatively low pitch feature of syllables not associated with high tone results from a late default assignment of pitch values.

[4]The spelling of Qafar forms is in accordance with the recently adopted orthography. (For a discussion of this, the reader is referred to Parker and Hayward, 1985: 5–7). In this orthography, the only letters requiring comment are *q*, *c*, and *z*, which represent a voiced pharyngeal fricative, a voiceless pharyngeal fricative, and a voiced retroflex plosive respectively. Long consonants and vowels are represented with double letters.

2. (a) *awki (gufeh)*
a boy (arrived)

(b) *taamitak yen awki (gufeh)*
(the) boy who was working (arrived)

3. *yi bazih kataysih ina (gufteh)*
my son's friend's mother (arrived)

4. (a) *darò yokmeh suge hantuuta tiggife dummu dsiriye kuti (àh kaa)*
grain he-had-eaten rat she-killed cat he chased dog (this is him)
(this is) the dog that chased the cat that killed the rat that had eaten the grain

(b) *kuti dummù (dsiriyeh)*
(the) dog (chased) (the) cat

(c) *dummù darò yokmeh sugeh hantuuta (tiggifeh)*
cat grain he-had-eaten rat (killed)
(the) cat (killed) (the) rat that had eaten (the) grain

In order to predict which syllable of the first word high tone will be associated with, accent has to be taken into account. The association operates according to the rule given in 5.

5. *High Tone Association (NPs and PPs)*

If the first word contains an accented syllable, H will associate with that syllable. Otherwise, H will associate with the final syllable of the first word.

The rule assumes that only some words are accented, though provided it appeared in the appropriate syntactic configuration, any

word could have the high tone associated with it. The rule accounts for the differences in location of the high tone in pairs of phrases such as the following.

6. (a) *kúta (màfaza)*
(I don't like) dog(s)

(b) *a kúta (màfaza)*
(I don't like) this dog

7. (a) *dúmmu (màfaza)*
(I don't like) cat(s)

(b) *a dúmmu (màfaza)*
(I don't like) this cat

While phrasal high tone always associates with the first word of a phrase, which syllable it associates with depends upon whether or not the word is accented, and if it is, upon which syllable the accent is located. Thus, *kúta* 'dog' in 6 is accented on the penultimate symbol, *dúmmu* 'cat' in 7 is unaccented.

In our original treatment, the assignment of accent distinguishes two cases: (i) the case of nouns to which accent is assigned in virtue of morphological and morpho-syntactic categories such as 'root', 'gender' and 'case'; (ii) the case of nouns where the accent cannot be

assigned by such means. For the first situation, the following rule was given.

> 8. Accent is assigned to the final root syllable of the absolutive form[5] of a masculine noun, unless that noun carries lexical accent.

This rule accounts for the majority of nouns ending in consonants (virtually all are masculine) and all vowel-final masculine nouns. The final vowel in the latter group, although lexically determined, is not reckoned as part of the root, since it is replaced by any vocalic case marker.[6] Examples of nouns receiving accent in this way are given in 9.

[5]The absolutive form may be regarded as the unmarked form of a noun. It is identical to the citation form for all V-final nouns. But this identity does not obtain for C-final nouns. From the point of view of syntax, citation forms in Qafar are predicative complements, and in this function C-final nouns take a copular element which in the pronounced word consists simply of a vowel harmonizing with respect to features of roundness and lowness inherent in the last stem vowel. e.g.

absolutive form	citation form	
cán	*cánu*	milk
dayáb	*dayábi*	marriage
debèn	*debènu*	beard
bùn	*bùnu*	coffee
moymòb	*moymòbu*	stud animal

Nevertheless, the phonological shape of the absolutive form of a C-final noun is essentially an abstraction, for although it occurs in direct object function with no additional element affixed to it, the very fact of its being C-final may bring about a process of closed syllable contraction, which neutralizes vowel length in the final syllable. Any underlying quantity distinction is only revealed when a vowel-initial element is attached. This occurs, for example, in the following citation forms.

absolutive form	citation form	
lubák	*lubaáka*	lion
daqár	*daqaára*	wadi
dúl	*duúlu*	hippopotamus

[6]For example:

9. (a) C-final: *cán* milk

danán donkey

maymaqút making peace, repairing

mukaalafút breach, violation

(b) V-final: *gúra* left hand

fakéyna key, opener

makaabánna wisdom, sagacity

keemaarítiyya dissension

Masculine nouns not receiving the accent by this rule are regarded as having lexical accent. Such nouns are a minority; they are all consonant-final and are accented on the penultimate syllable of the root. e.g.

10. *qáday* tree species

kaáker greed

munkuzuz insomnia

eddehaysít defendant

All remaining nouns are vowel-final and feminine in gender, and, according to our analysis, are unaccented. e.g.

	absolutive	nominative	genitive 1	genitive 2
boy	dúka	aúki	aúki	aúkiʔ
children	úrru	urri	urri	urriʔ
house	qári	qari	qari	qariʔ

11.	*buza*	house
	kontayto	tree species
	kanaanaho	hearty laughter
	mankanaanaca	getting up (of a fire)

At this point I should like to introduce a slightly different analysis. Gender is extremely important in Qafar; it has, for example, consequences in terms of verb agreement, e.g.

12.	*kuti rabeh*	vs.	*dummù rabteh*
	(the) dog(m.) died		(the) cat(f.) died

As the account given above makes clear, there is a strong correlation between phonological factors and gender in this language. Our 1985 account operates on the assumption that gender, being a largely arbitrary categorization of nouns from a semantic point of view, has to be entered at the deepest lexical level; thus, it is available as a determinant for a rule such as that given in 8 for accent. While this approach is adequate for descriptive purposes, it contains redundancies, and, more significantly, it fails to address the problem faced by language learners acquiring nominal gender. Addressing this question leads one to conclude that the correlation of phonology with gender must be exploited. The ability to read gender off phonetic forms could be achieved in two possible ways. It would, for example, be possible to deduce feminine gender on the basis of the fact that citation forms of vowel-final nouns had high tone on the final syllable; all other nouns would then be masculine. An alternative strategy would then be to deduce masculine gender on the basis of a citation form of a noun being either consonant-final or having high tone on some syllable other than the final one; all other nouns then being feminine. Of course, neither strategy necessarily excludes the other. But in any event, it should be clear that gender will not be available for assigning accent as stated in 8. Accent is, however, still necessary, for no strategy can avoid the need to distinguish in some way certain subsets of nouns the citation forms of which never bear

high tone on a final syllable, and thereby constitute the 'special case' for high tone asssociation (cf. 5) and furnish the basis for employing the accentual diacritic.

In the 1985 account we subdivided masculine nouns in the following way.

13.

	C/V-final	syllable bearing H	treatment
group 1	C-final	penult	accented lexically
group 2	C-final	ultima	assigned accent by rule 8
	V-final	penult	

(It will be recalled that the two types of group 2 were united by reference to a morphological entity, viz. the root, the final syllable of which was assigned accent.) Under this analysis, all masculine nouns are accented.

A more parsimonious and more insightful analysis may be achieved on the basis of 14.

14.

	C/V-final	syllable bearing H	treatment
group 1	C-final	penult	accented lexically
	V-final	penult	
group 2	C-final	ultima	unaccented

The differences are, I believe, quite significant. Rule 8 is no longer needed, thereby leaving us free to regard gender as derivative, rather than primitive. Another difference is that the set of unaccented nouns (i.e., nouns that bear phrasal high tone via the default clause of 5) is greatly increased, for the majority of C-final nouns (illustrated in 9(a)) will be added to this set. This is also significant, for the class of unaccented words also includes every possible type of nominal modifier. Qafar is a strict S-O-V, i.e., head-final, language,

and every type of NP specifier or complement precedes the head, and all of them achieve association with the phrasal high tone by means of the default clause of 5. Thus, the reanalysis of the majority of consonant-final nouns as unaccented drastically reduces the number of exceptions to the general rule. It is, perhaps, a further advantage of this analysis that it isolates all exceptions to the general rule in one place, namely, the lexicon.

To this point my account of nouns has been confined to a consideration of their appearances in absolutive case. Like most Cushitic and Omotic languages, Qafar is what I have elsewhere termed a 'nominative' language (Hayward, 1988). The defining characteristics of such languages are: (i) a marked (nominative) case form for a noun as head of a subject NP vs. an unmarked (absolutive) case form for a noun as head of any complement NP (including direct object function); (ii) identical morphological behaviour for subjects of intransitive as well as transitive verbs. The first feature sets such languages apart from 'accusative' languages like Latin, Greek, German, Amharic, etc., which have at least some marked accusative forms. The second feature separates this type from 'ergative' languages such as Basque, Eskimo, etc., in which only the subjects of transitive verbs take nominative marking. In Qafar, overt segmental nominative marking is confined to V-final masculine nouns, and consists in a substitution of a nominative case inflection -i for the final vowel. From the point of view of the present analysis of high tone association, nominative marking is probably best described as bringing about accentual suppression (or deletion), for the resultant form bears high tone finally, providing it is not preceded by any other word(s) in its phrase, i.e., it is a form which can be accounted for by an appeal to the default clause of 5. e.g.

15. (a) *kuti hantuùta yiggifeh*
(a) dog killed (a) rat

(b) *hantuuti kùta yiggifeh*
(a) rat killed a dog

However, it is not affixation of the nominative suffix -i that effects this so much as the syntactic configuration itself that triggers accentual suppression, for the same behaviour with regard to high tone association is witnessed in what have been analysed as accented consonant-final nouns, e.g.

16. (a) *kuti àqan yubleh*
    (a) dog saw a frog cf. *kúta* (m.abs.)
    (b) *aqàn kùta yubleh*
    (a) frog saw a dog cf. *áqan* (m.abs.)

Similar behaviour is observed in genitive constructions, where accent is suppressed in the possessor noun whether or not any overt segmental genitive marking occurs. e.g.

17. (a) *kuti zagor*
    dog's fur
    (b) *à kutih zagor*[7]
    this dog's fur

The reason why in our earlier analysis we did not group together C-final and V-final nouns in which H associates with the ultimate syllable (i.e., why we posited the analysis of 13, rather than that of 14) rested upon what appears to be differential behaviour exhibited by these two classes of items when functioning as complements of postpositions. If, for example, we compare the behaviour of C-final (masculine) nouns such as *càn* 'milk' or *dandn* 'donkey' with that of the two types (masculine and feminine) of V-final noun in postpositional phrases, we observe that the masculine nouns appear to pattern in the same way. e.g.

[7]It is to be noted that genitive marking in Qafar-Saho languages differs according to whether the possessor NP is expanded or not; cf. the forms in Note 6.

18. (a) *cánal*
in milk cf. *cán* (m.abs.)

(b) *danának*
from (a) donkey cf. *danán* (m.abs.)

(c) *qárıl*
in (a) house cf. *qárı* (m.abs.)

(d) *kútak*
from (a) dog cf. *kúta* (m.abs.)

(e) *sagák*
from (a) cow cf. *sagá* (f.abs.)

(f) *daról*
in grain cf. *daró* (f.abs.)

The only type of noun that appears to take the default clause for H association is that exemplified in (e) and (f). In PPs whose complements are masculine nouns, H never associates with the vowel of the final syllable, i.e., in such structures C-final nouns appear not to achieve H association via the default clause of 5. The earlier analysis, which grouped C-final nouns having H on the penult in the absolutive, together with V-final nouns having H on the penult in the absolutive (i.e., the analysis of 13) seems to be justified by this behaviour. It will be recalled that in order to accomplish the correct association of H, accent was assigned to the root-final syllable of all such nouns in virtue of their gender property (cf. 8).

We have, however, to take into account a difference in the status of the vowel preceding the postposition in V-final and C-final nouns. For V-final nouns the vowel is always present and has to be regarded as part of the underived lexical entry. For C-final nouns, however, the vowel clearly alternates with zero. By far the simplest analysis is to regard these vowels as epenthetic. Qafar syllable structure does not permit more than a single branching in the rhyme, as a consequence of which word-final consonant clusters do not occur. When

a postposition or any other type of phrase-final element undergoes cliticization on to a C-final word, epenthesis occurs to ensure proper syllabification. Whether the epenthtic vowel will be realised as *ɪ*, *u*, or *a* is determined by features inherent in the immediately preceding vowel.[8] Providing this epenthesis is not required to apply until after H association has taken place, forms such as *cànal* (18(a)) and *danànak* (18(b)) pose no problem for the analysis proposed here. Shorn of all formalism, a sample derivation would then proceed as in 19.

19.	underlying forms	*/danan/ + /k/*
	cliticization	*danank*
		H
	H association (default case)	*danank*
		H
	epenthesis	*dananak*
	surface form	*danànak*

Support for this interpretation comes in the form of other structures involving clitics. For example, Qafar makes productive use of a nominalization process which takes as its base any type of NP modifier and attaches to it a dummy head element *m*. e.g.

20. (a) ***annim tayse***
which-*m* she-is-better
which one/thing is better?

[8]This process is identical to that illustrated in the citation forms of C-final nouns given in Note 5.

cf. (b) *anni saga tayse*
which cow she-is-better
which cow is better?

(c) *meqèm zise*
it-is-good-*m* he-built
he built a good one

cf. (d) *meqè buza zise*
it-is-good house he-built
he built a good house

In the event that the modifier is a C-final word, cliticization of *m* triggers vowel epenthesis, and in this case also H tone associated with an ultimate syllable (by default association) never shifts to the epenthetic pre-clitic vowel. e.g.

21. (a) *yublèn num bayeh*
they-saw person he disappeared
the person whom they saw disappeared

but (b) *yubleènim bayteh*[9]
they-saw-*m* she disappeared
the one whom they saw disappeared

There are a number of similar cases in the language, and unless we analyse the epenthesis as a late process occurring after H association, each of them will require a special accent assignment rule comparable to 8, though the morphological details would vary from case to case.

A worthwhile bonus accompanies this analysis. Hayward and Corbett (1988) argue that in Qafar the unmarked or default gender is

[9]The change of agreement in the verb form follows from the fact that nominalizations in *-m* take the default, i.e., feminine gender in Qafar. The alternation of vowel length in the relative clause verb froms in 21(a) and (b) result from the closed syllable contraction process referred to in Note 5.

the feminine. It is, for example, feminine agreement that is required by 'syntactic nominalizations' such as those seen in 20(a) and 21(b). Moreover, the verb agreement required by the great majority of cases of NP conjunction is feminine (for details, see the above-mentioned article). Putting together some of the conclusions of that paper concerning gender and the present ones concerning tone and accent, we observe an interesting correlation, namely, that default H tone association (i.e., the association which does not need to appeal to accent) and the default gender coincide in all cases except that of lexical nouns ending in consonants. But in this latter case consonant-finality already indicates that they must take masculine agreement. The situation may be summarized in this way: if a lexical noun ends in a consonant and/or carries accent, it is masculine; otherwise, it is feminine.

To the extent that they have been investigated, loan words provide interesting confirmation that this correlation is significant. Thus, we observe that loan words such as those in 22 are pronounced with H tone on the final syllable even when the (stress) accent of those words in the source language is not final. Moreover, the gender agreement required by these words is feminine, even when their gender in the language of origin is not feminine.

22.	*tawlà* (f.)	table	<Ital. 'tavola (f.) id.
	gommà (f.)	tyre	<Ital. 'gomma (f.) id.
	kadò (f.)	prize	<Fr. ca'deau (m.) id.
	rankò (f.)	class, rank	<Ital. 'rango (m.) id.
	kamadoorò (f.)	tomato	<Ital. poma'doro (m.) id.
	kɨtfò (f.)	minced meat	<Eth.S. 'kɨtfo (m.) id.
	seftà (f.)	outlaw	<Eth.S. 'sɨfta (m.) id.

Consideration of what is known about tone and accent in Saho suggests that Qafar has undergone a simplification in the rule governing the association of H. It has been shown here for Qafar that H always associates with the first word in the phrase, whether that word is accented or not; the presence or absence of an accent only determines with which syllable association occurs. Welmers (1952)

gives a brief account of accent ('stress' in his terms) in Saho, where he shows cases of H asssociated not with the first, but with the second word of the phrase. In fact, his data provide minimal pairs such as the following (p.157).

23.	*yibàza*	vs.	*yibaza*
	my son		my daughter

Since many types of nominal modifier might be interposed between *yi* and its head, the former has clearly to be regarded as a distinct word, so that the above forms should be written as *yi bàza* and *yi baza*, thus revealing the phrasal nature of the phenomenon.[10] But the point to be noted is that although it is the first word in the phrase, H is not always associated with *yi*. Interestingly, those cases where this does not happen are precisely those where, in the cognate Qafar forms, the second (head) word would be accented according to our analysis; cf. Qafar:

24. (a) *yi baza*
my son cf. *bàza* (m.abs.) son

(b) *yi baza*
my daughter cf. *bazà* (f.abs.) daughter

[10]In essence, Welmers's analysis shows some similarity to the one advanced here (and, for that matter, the one advanced in Parker and Hayward, 1985). For Welmers, only high pitch on a non-final syllable is regarded as stress; high pitch on final syllables is said not to be stress (1952: 147ff). By contrast, in Bliese's analysis, wherever the high pitch occurs, it is identified as stress. By separating out accent (a diacritic with no phonetic content of its own) from a single phrasal high tone, we recognize a phonological identity in the same phonetic signal but avoid (a) proliferating accents; and (b) resorting to extensive stress reduction rules.

Cases similar to these abound in my fieldnotes on the Irob variety of Saho. e.g.

25. (a) *ku kàre geye*
your dog I-found
I found your dog cf. *kàre* (m.abs.)

vs. (b) *kù dummu geye*
I found your cat cf. *dummù* (f.abs.)

(c) *kulus sàgog uble*
fat cows I-saw
I saw fat cows cf. *sàgog* (m.abs.)

vs. (d) *kulùs saga uble*
I saw (a) fat cow cf. *sagà* (f.abs.)

(e) *qayso/b/ biso*[11]
grass-of colour
(the) colour of grass cf. *qaysò* (f.abs.) *biso* (m.abs.)

vs. (f) *qaysò/f/ fire*
seed of grass cf. fire (f.abs.)

(g) *cargeṣ ikok*[12]
(a) crocodile's teeth cf. *cargèṣ* (m.abs.), *ikok* (m.abs)

vs. (h) *cargèṣ lafa*
(a) crocodile's bone cf. *lafà* (f.abs.)

It does not seem to be the case that H associates with an accented syllable in a word any further to the right than the second one in the phrase.[13] e.g.

[11]The inter-word gemination evident in genitive marking in feminine nouns in Saho and Qafar appears to involve an assimilation process. An alternative account for the phenomenon is given in Hayward (forthcoming).

[12]*ṣ* represents IPA [ts']; it occurs in Irob Saho exclusively in Tigrinya loan words.

[13]I have to own, however, that my investigations have not been exhaustive enough as to eliminate the possibility of this.

26. (a) *yi dıkıh bıso*
my house-of colour
the colour of my house cf. *bıso* (m.abs.)

(b) *tày aqanıh ıba*
this frog-of leg
this frog's leg cf. *ıba* (m.abs.)

(c) *ùsuk ed mare qare nuble*
he in-it he-lives house we-saw
we saw the house in which he lives cf. *qàre* (m.abs.)

In 26(b) it should be noted that the absolutive form of the word 'frog' is *àqan*, and would, therefore, be regarded as accented, i.e., as *áqan*. But in Irob Saho, as in Qafar, there is accentual suppression in the genitive.[14] The behaviour of phrasal H in Irob Saho (and possibly in other varieties of Saho too) calls for a slightly more complex rule than that stated in 5 for Qafar. Tentatively, I would propose the following.

27. *High Tone Association (NPs, PPs)*

H associates with the first (leftmost) accented syllable in the first two words of the phrase. If neither word contains an accent, H will associate with the final syllable of the first word.

It may be hypothesised that at some point in the development of Qafar, the rule was simplified so as to scan only the first word in the phrase.

The somewhat larger domain of phrasal association in Irob Saho furnishes the final piece of evidence I shall adduce for the reanalysis

[14]This is not the case for certain types of noun in the nominative in Irob. Thus, in subject function, accent is not suppressed in C-final nouns such as *áqan* 'frog'.

proposed in this paper, for, as far as accent itself is concerned, both language varieties considered here can be regarded as identical. The difference between the earlier (1985) analysis and the present one may be reduced to the single issue of whether or not C-final nouns in which H associates with the final syllable in the absolutive are accented. For example, in the lexicon, do we regard nouns like *càn* and *danàn* as *can* and *danan* or as *can* and *danan*? Based solely upon Qafar, the arguments for treating such items as unaccented are indirect, for they depend upon according plausibility to some other area of analysis first; in particular, to the analysis of epenthesis. Irob Saho, however, offers us the opportunity of testing hypotheses about these words, for since Irob allows H to associate with the second words of phrases in the event that the second word is accented and the first is not, we can inspect appropriate contexts to see how tonal association takes place. As the following representative examples show, when preceded by an unaccented word, nouns of the type under investigation behave as unaccented, and when followed by accented nouns, they again behave as unaccented.

28. (a) *tòy lubak*
that lion — cf. *lubàk* (m.abs.)

and (b) *lubak ɨiba*
(a) lion's leg — cf. *ɨiba* (m.abs.)

(c) *numà/b/ bakal*
(a) woman's goat — cf. *numà* (f.abs), *bakàl* (m.abs.)

and (d) *bakal biso*
(a) goat's colour — cf. *biso* (m.abs.)

(e) *laqin can*
hot milk — cf. *càn* (m.abs.)

and (f) *canti biso*
(the) colour of milk — cf. *biso* (m.abs.)

and (g) *cant/à/yni (= canti ayni)*[15]
(a) milk gourd cf. *ayni* (f.abs.)

REFERENCES

Banti, G. (forthcoming). 'Two Cushitic Systems: Somali and Oromo Nouns.' To appear in van der Hulst, H. and N. V. Smith (eds.) *Autosegmental Studies on Pitch Accent.*

Bliese, L. F. (1981). *A Generative Grammar of Afar.* (SIL Publications in Linguistics 65). Dallas: SIL and University of Texas at Arlington.

Goldsmith, J. (1976). *Autosegmental Phonology.* Indiana University Linguistics Club. [Published by Garland Press 1979]

— (1982). 'Accent Systems.' Pp.47–63 in van der Hulst, H. and N.V. Smith (eds.) *The Structure of Phonological Representations (Part 1).* Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Hayward, D. (=R. J.) (1984). *The Arbore Language: a First Investigation; Including a Vocabulary.* (Kuschitische Sprachstudien; Bd.2). Hamburg: Buske.

— (1988). 'Is there a Language with an Indefinite Nominative — Burji?' Pp. 679–691 in Taddese Beyene (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies, University of Addis Ababa,* 1984, Vol. 1, Huntingdon, Elm Publications.

— (forthcoming). 'Underspecification Theory in the Analysis of the Feminine Gender in Qafar'. To appear in *Israel Oriental Studies.*

Hayward, R. J. and G. G. Corbett. (1988). 'Resolution Rules in Qafar.' *Linguistics* 26: 259–279.

Hyman, L. M. (1981). 'L'accento tonale in somalo.' Pp.109–139 in Cardona, G. R. and F. Agostini (eds.) *Fonologia e lessico. Studi Somali* 1. Roma: Ministero per gli Affari Esteri e Comitato tecnico linguistico per l'Università nazionale somala.

Morin, D. (1977). 'Le nom en Afar du sud.' *BSOAS* 40,2: 354–370.

[15]Both in Irob Saho and Qafar, the genitive of C-final monosyllabic nouns such as *can* involves suffixation of *-ti*. Crasis occurs at vocalic junctures between words, as in 28(g).

Parker, E. M. and R. J. Hayward. (1985). *An Afar-English-French Dictionary (with Grammatical Notes in English)*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

Pillinger, S. (1988). 'Tone and Accent in Rendille: a Preliminary Investigation.' Pp. 503–511 in Marianne Bechhaus-Gerst and Fritz Serzisko (eds.) *Cushutic-Omotic. Papers from the International Symposium on Cushitic and Omotic Languages, Cologne, January 6–9, 1986*. Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.

Welmers, W. (1952). 'Notes on the Structure of Saho', Part 1: *Word* 8,1: 145–162, Part 2: Word 8,3: 236–251.